

### **REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 24, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 7-12, 29, 35-38, 40, and 41 are hereby amended; and claim 58 is hereby added. Accordingly, claims 1-58 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-22, 24, 26, 29-33, 35-50, 52, 54, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,082). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As set forth at M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when, among other things, all the claim limitations are taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that Suzuki et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every element as presently set forth at least in claims 1 and 29. For example, Applicant respectfully submits that Suzuki et al. fails to teach or suggest, “a plurality of gate bus lines arranged in a first direction on said first substrate and a plurality of data bus lines arranged in a second direction on said first substrate to define a pixel region; an underlying layer directly beneath said plurality of data bus lines and in said pixel region; a passivation layer directly on said plurality of data bus lines and directly on portions of said underlying layer in said pixel region; [and] an electric field inducing window in said pixel region; ... wherein said electric field inducing window is aligned with a portion of said passivation layer that is directly on said underlying layer,” as presently recited in claim 1 or “a plurality of gate bus lines arranged in a first direction on said first substrate and a plurality of data bus lines arranged in a second direction on said first substrate to define a pixel region; an underlying layer directly beneath said plurality of data bus lines and in said pixel region; a passivation layer directly on said plurality of data bus lines and directly on portions of said underlying layer in said pixel region; a pixel electrode on said first substrate; ... [and] an electric field inducing window in said pixel electrode, ... wherein said electric field inducing window is aligned with a portion of said passivation layer that is directly on said underlying layer,” as presently recited in claim 29. For at least these reasons, Applicants

respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 29, and claims 2-5, 7-22, 24, 26, 30-33, 35-50, 52, 54, and 57, which variously depend therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 27, 28, 55, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Sugiyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,455). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 27, 28, 55, and 56 variously depend from claims 1 and 29 and, therefore, include the various elements recited by claims 1 and 29. As established above, Suzuki et al. fails to render claims 1 and 29 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Moreover, Sugiyama et al. fails to cure the deficiency of Suzuki et al. with respect to claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 27, 28, 55, and 56 are nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at least by virtue of their various dependence from claims 1 and 29. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27, 28, 55, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of the Applicant's related art, Koma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,608,556), and "No-Rub Multi-Domain TFT Using Surrounding-Electrode Method," SID, 1995, pages 869-872 (hereinafter referred to as "SID 1995"). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 6 and 34 respectively depend from claims 1 and 29 and, therefore, include the various elements recited by claims 1 and 29. As established above, Suzuki et al. fails to render claims 1 and 29 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Moreover, neither the Applicant's related art, Koma et al., nor SID 1995, singly or in combination, cures the deficiency of Suzuki et al. with respect to claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 34 are nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at least by virtue of their respective dependence from claims 1 and 29. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Bos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,074). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 23 and 25 respectively depend from claims 1 and 29 and, therefore, include the various elements recited by claims 1 and 29. As established above, Suzuki et al. fails to render claims 1 and 29 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Moreover, Bos et al. fails to cure the deficiency of Suzuki et al. with respect to claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23 and 25 are nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at least by virtue of their respective dependence from claims 1 and 29. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 51 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Van De Witte (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,692). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 51 and 53 respectively depend from claims 1 and 29 and, therefore, include the various elements recited by claims 1 and 29. As established above, Suzuki et al. fails to render claims 1 and 29 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Moreover, Van De Witte fails to cure the deficiency of Suzuki et al. with respect to claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 51 and 53 are nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at least by virtue of their respective dependence from claims 1 and 29. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 51 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 09/541,426  
Amdt. dated May 24, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action dated February 24, 2005

Docket No.: 8733.230.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: May 24, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
George G. Ballas

Registration No.: 52,587

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant